IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA Richmond Division

7	AUG 1 6 2017	
Cl	ERK, U.S. DISTRICT C RICHMOND, VA	OURT

SCOTT ANTHONY OBERLANDER,	CLERK, U.S. DISTRIC
Plaintiff,) RICHMONO.
v.) Civil Action No. 3:17CV265–HEH
MICHAEL E. McGINTY, et al.,)
Defendants.	j

MEMORANDUM OPINION (Dismissing Action Without Prejudice)

Plaintiff, a Virginia inmate proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. In order to state a viable claim under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, a plaintiff must allege that a person acting under color of state law deprived him or her of a constitutional right or of a right conferred by a law of the United States. *See Dowe v. Total Action Against Poverty in Roanoke Valley*, 145 F.3d 653, 658 (4th Cir. 1998) (citing 42 U.S.C. § 1983). In his current complaint, Plaintiff fails to provide the defendants with fair notice of the facts and legal basis upon which his or her liability rests. Accordingly, by Memorandum Order entered on July 13, 2017, the Court directed Plaintiff to submit a particularized complaint within fourteen (14) days of the date of entry thereof. The Court warned Plaintiff that the failure to submit the particularized complaint would result in the dismissal of the action.

More than fourteen (14) days have elapsed since the entry of the July 13, 2017

Memorandum Order. Plaintiff failed to submit a particularized complaint or otherwise

responded to the July 13, 2017 Memorandum Order. Accordingly, the action will be dismissed without prejudice.

2

An appropriate order will accompany this Memorandum Opinion.

HENRY E. HUDSON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE